

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing and reconsideration of the application identified in caption, as amended, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. §1.116 and in light of the remarks which follow, are respectfully requested.

At the outset, Applicants thank Examiner Hon of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office for her time and consideration in participating in an interview with Applicants' representative on April 19, 2006. The Interview Summary accurately reflects the substance of the interview.

During the interview, the Examiner and Applicants' representative discussed the proposed amendment of incorporating the subject matter of claim 14 into independent claim

1. The Examiner agreed that such amendment would be effective to overcome the prior art rejections.

Accordingly, by the above amendments, claim 14 has been canceled and the subject matter thereof has been incorporated into claim 1. It is noted that the Examiner agreed to enter such amendment at this stage of prosecution. Withdrawn claims 20-28 and 37-39 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 7 has been amended to correct the spelling of the word "olefin." Claim 34 has been amended to correct a typographical error by adding a period at the end of the claim. Entry of the foregoing amendments is proper at least because they are effective to place the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. See M.P.E.P. §714.12.

In the Official Action, claims 1-19 and 29-36 have been provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being obvious over claims 1-3, 11-29, 33, 42 and 46-51 of copending Application No. 11/123,122. Without addressing the propriety of this rejection, and in order to expedite prosecution of the present

application, submitted herewith is a Terminal Disclaimer with respect to the '122 application. The filing of such Terminal Disclaimer is effective to overcome the present obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of such rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17, 19 and 29-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,521,312 (*Keiser*) in view of European Patent Document No. 0 385 054 (*Löfgren*) and U.S. Patent No. 5,670,224 (*Izu*). Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Keiser* in view of *Löfgren* and *Izu*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,591,522 (*Sakai*). As discussed above, the Examiner agreed that amending claim 1 by incorporating the subject matter of claim 14 therein would be effective to overcome the above rejections. By the above amendments, claim 1 has been amended in such manner. Accordingly, for at least this reason, withdrawal of the above rejections is respectfully requested.

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order, and such action is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions concerning this paper or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC (INCLUDING ATTORNEYS
FROM BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS)

Date: May 8, 2006

By: 
Roger H. Lee
Registration No. 46,317

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620